

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respond herein to the Office Action of December 10, 2008. Claims 1-52 were pending in the Application prior to the present Amendment. All claims were rejected in the Office Action. Applicants amend Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 13-14, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-30, 36, 40-42, 44-45 and 47, cancel Claims 4, 15, 21 and respectfully request a reconsideration of the rejection. Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-20 and 22-52 remain in the application.

Claims 1-2 were objected to in the Office Action because of certain informalities. Applicants corrected the informalities and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 13 and 40 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims improperly defined the computer program. Applicants corrected Claims 13 and 40 to recite that the computer program is embodied on a computer-readable medium encoded with computer executable instructions. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-25 and 36-52 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the statutory classes. Applicants amended Claims 9-25 and 36-52 to tie the steps to a particular apparatus (i.e., the memory devices, display device, processor, or general computer) and respectfully request a reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-52 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gurner et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,537) in view of Maybury et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,954).

Independent Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 14, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40, 41 and 47 recite a system, method and program for viewing a desired video from several video groups. All independent claims were amended to recite that the first video group (e.g., the raw material group of Fig. 4A) includes multiple first group videos each having a plurality of sections and that the second video group (e.g., the edited video group of Fig. 4A) includes a plurality of second group videos “produced by editing said first group videos of said first video group such that each second group video includes **selected sections of at least two first group videos.**” (*Emphasis added*).

Neither Gurner nor Maybury disclose these limitations of independent Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 14, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40, 41 and 47.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 14, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40, 41 and 47 are allowable over the cited prior art. Claims 5-8, 10-12, 16-19, 22-25, 31-35, 37-39, 42-46 and 48-52 depend from Claim 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 14, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40, 41 and 47. Therefore, Claims 5-8, 10-12, 16-19, 22-25, 31-35, 37-39, 42-46 and 48-52 are allowable at least for the same reasons as Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 14, 20, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 40, 41 and 47 and, further, on their own merits.

For added emphasis, applicant comments further on the prior art as follows.

As to the Gurner reference, Gurner just teaches a general procedure for generating video by editing a variety of materials. Furthermore, the present application and the Gurner reference are fundamentally different, as Gurner does not teach nor suggest that frequency-of-use of video is calculated. Accordingly, it is impossible in the Gurner invention to identify useful video section based on frequency-of-use of video.

With regard to the Maybury reference, Maybury discloses a system for providing metadata by analyzing video content, and a system for viewing video by using the metadata. In Maybury, video is selected and presented based on tag frequencies. A GUI, which counts tags extracted from video and displays the counted number, is shown in Fig. 14.

However, frequency of occurrence of tags is totally different from frequency-of-use of video content, in the editing process of the present claims. A tag is extracted, for example, from a closed caption or speech recognition facility (Fig. 1 named entity tagging 128). Therefore, information about tags is information of what kind of topics and how many topics there are. Though this information helps to judge which topics are important, it is impossible to judge which scenes are important, as the information of tags does not indicate the frequency of use of video sections. That is, there are various scenes in video broadcasting specific topics, however, tag information cannot provide the information of which scene is the most frequently used in related videos, even if it can judge the importance of the topic. Accordingly, there is no way to know which scene is the most important from the tag information of Maybury.

On the other hand, in the present claims, the actual frequency of use is counted and presented. It enables pinpointing useful parts in video content by its frequency of use. If video content is just raw video materials, there are many parts thereof which are redundant or useless.

Therefore, it is indeed important to specify useful video sections by frequency of use information of the video when producing programs by re-editing the same video. Neither Gurner nor Maybury discloses a system which pinpoints useful video section based on frequency of use of video.


The Examiner alleges Maybury discloses the first, second and third video groups. However, all these groups are such as video grouped by proper name, and video backed to system as a result of search. These do not bear any relation to the present claim wherein the second video is produced from the first video. The Examiner actually points out the videos grouped in column 16, lines 47-57 and grouped in column 17, lines 1-8. However, these videos are quite irrelevant.

Further, contrary to the Office Action, the correlation 120 in Figure 1 does not relate one video to another video. Rather, what Maybury discloses is "Event Correlation", as described in column 13, line 56. That is, Maybury does not correlate video though it enhances division accuracy of topics in video based on correlation obtained from video analysis. Thus, the Maybury invention is far different from the video correlation presented in the present claims.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
EFS FILING SYSTEM  
ON APRIL 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

  
MAX MOSKOWITZ  
Registration No.: 30,576  
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP  
1180 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8403  
Telephone: (212) 382-0700